

Application No. 10806041 (Docket: CNTR.2215)  
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 02/21/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 11/22/2006

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-3, 5-7, 16-18, and 20-23 are pending in the application. The Examiner additionally stated that claims 4, 8-15, and 19 are withdrawn from consideration, claims 1-3, 5-7, and 16-18 are rejected, and claims 20-23 are objected to. By this amendment, claims 5 and 20 have been cancelled and claims 1, 6, 16-17, and 21 have been amended. Applicant also notes that during the telephone interview conducted on 11/02/2006, a summary of which is appended to the instant office action, Group A, Species 1 and Group B, Species 1 were elected in response to the restriction requirement. Hence, claim 23 was withdrawn from consideration as well, and thus claims 1-3, 6-7, 16-18, and 21-22 are pending in the application.

Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the application, in view of the foregoing amendments.

#### **In the Specification**

Applicant has amended the specification to secure a substantial correspondence between the claims amended herein and the remainder of the specification. No new matter is presented.

#### **In the Claims**

##### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner objected to claims 20-23 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration and indications of allowability of these claims, and furthermore assumes that the allowance of claim 23 is a simple oversight, since this claim was previously withdrawn from consideration by Applicant's election. By this amendment, the allowable limitation of claim 20 has been incorporated into the language of claim 16. Claim 20 has been cancelled and those claims depending from claim 20 have been amended to now depend from claim 16, as appropriate.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Application No. 10806041 (Docket: CNTR.2215)  
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 02/21/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 11/22/2006

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Examiner noted that claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As per claim 1, the phrase "power control logic comprising: a plurality of stop signals" was noted as being unclear. The Examiner was unsure of how a physical device contains signals and noted that it appears as though the logic contains circuitry that can receive, generate, or forward the stop signals. The Examiner advised Applicant to rewrite the claim specifying how the power control logic and the plurality of stop signals are related on a physical level. The Examiner further noted that examination of claim 1 was precluded and in addition, claims 2-3 and 5-7 were rejected by virtue of their dependencies.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the plurality of stop signals are generated by the power control logic, thus particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming that subject matter which is regarded as the invention. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-7 be withdrawn.

Applicant further notes that the limitation of claim 5 has been incorporated in to the language of claim 1. This limitation is substantially similar to the limitation of claim 20, which the Examiner has indicated as being allowable.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No 5724591 to Hara et al. (Hara). As per claim 16, the examiner noted that Hara discloses a method for providing measured power transitions in a computing device, the method comprising:

- Determining if the computing device is to enter a low power state (column 5, line 41-column 6, line 16; 803); and
- Sequentially stopping clock signals (column 6, lines 16-22,23-29; 807-809) that are coupled to each of a plurality of sector logic elements (figure 1, processor units).

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Applicant respectfully traverses and notes that Hara does not teach:

- providing a programmable number of clock cycles that are to transpire between said stopping of the clock signals,

a limitation which has been indicated as being allowable over the prior art of record. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 16i.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara in view of US Patent No 4835728 to Si et al (Si). Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

As per claim 17, the Examiner noted that Hara discloses the method wherein said sequentially stopping comprises via each of a plurality of stop signals (inherent given column 6, lines 16-22,23-29; 807-809) coupled to each of the plurality of sector logic elements (figure 1, processor units), indicating that a corresponding one of the clock signals be stopped (column 6, lines 16-22; 807-809). The Examiner conceded that Hara fails to disclose wherein the clock signals are stopped after a programmable number of clock cycles have transpired, but that Si teaches wherein the clock signals are stopped after a programmable number of clock cycles have transpired (column 4, lines 9-13; column 6, lines 29-33). The Examiner opined that an advantage of the system taught by Si is the ability to analyze more easily the state of a malfunctioning system (column 4, lines 2-13), and that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Hara with the delayed stop clock signals as taught by Si. Motivation to modify is to improve debugging practice.

As per claim 18, the Examiner pointed out that Si teaches wherein said indicating comprises establishing the programmable number of clock cycles for the each of the plurality of stop signals (column 6, lines 15-24; the delay for each stop signal corresponds to the system clock to which the unit is attached).

Application No. 10806041 (Docket: CNTR.2215)  
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 02/21/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 11/22/2006

In reply, Applicant notes that the allowable limitation of claim 20 has been incorporated into the language of claim 16 and since claims 17-18 depend from claim 16 and add further limitations over that which has been indicated as being allowable, it is requested that the rejections of claims 17-18 be withdrawn.

Application No. 10806041 (Docket: CNTR.2215)  
37 CFR 1.111 Amendment dated 02/21/2007  
Reply to Office Action of 11/22/2006

**CONCLUSIONS**

In view of the arguments advance above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3, 6-7, 16-18, and 21-22 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested, and allowance of the claims is solicited.

Applicant earnestly requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone if the Examiner has any questions or suggestions concerning this amendment, the application, or allowance of any claims thereof.

I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8 that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date of signature shown below.

Respectfully submitted,  
**HUFFMAN PATENT GROUP, LLC**

*/ Richard K. Huffman /*

By: \_\_\_\_\_

**RICHARD K. HUFFMAN, P.E.**  
Registration No. 41,082  
Tel: (719) 575-9998

*02/21/2007*

Date: \_\_\_\_\_